REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending. No amendment is made in this response. Reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the following arguments.

Claims 1-17 stand finally rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,127,651 to Okada ("the '651 patent"). This contention, however, is respectfully traversed because the rejections completely lack the proper support by the disclosure of the '651 patent and the rejections fail to meet the Patent Office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability.

Claim 1 recites a gaming machine that includes a simulation system which runs the simulation that simulates the playing of the game to simulate the entire playing of the game round from start to finish. The gaming machine also includes a comparator which compares the end condition of the simulation with the precalculated desired outcome, and an adjustment means which adjusts the starting parameters such that the end condition of a subsequent running of the simulation in a visible manner coincides with the end condition of the desired outcome of the game. Hence, a subsequent running is done in a visible manner, coinciding with the end condition that is desired. Therefore, this gaming machine runs each game round twice: first in an

invisible manner as a simulation, and subsequently visibly so that the user can see it.

The disclosure of the cited '651 patent bears no resemblance to the gaming machine recited in Claim 1. More specifically, the cited '651 patent describes a slot machine which provides a user payout data which a player may use to influence his or her decision to play that particular machine. The payout data displayed includes payout data reflecting the payout history of a set of previous games and also hypothetical payout data for future games. The system is configured to play a number of simulated games in order to generate the hypothetical payout data. The idea behind the game is that by providing payout data to the player this may enable a player to ascertain the transient probability of winning on the particular gaming machine.

In comparison with Claim 1 of the present application, the system in the cited '651 patent is very different in various aspects. For example, in one aspect, the gaming machine in Claim 1 may be implemented to use a simulation to generate the screen display for a current game being played. On a first running of the simulation, if the simulation outcome does not match a predetermined game outcome, then the initial conditions of the simulation may be adjusted and the simulation is re-run

so as to have the correct final outcome. The cited '651 patent completely fails to teach such features.

More specifically, Claim 1 recites the following:

> a comparator for comparing an end condition of said simulation run by the simulation system in an invisible manner using the starting parameters, with a pre-calculated desired outcome of the game.

In this regard, the cited '651 patent fails to teach or suggest comparison between the end condition of the simulation with a pre-calculated desired outcome for the game. In the cited '651 patent, the outcome of the game is indicated on a graph of the type depicted in Figure 3 to show the user what the simulated outcome of the next game would have been. Hence, the cited '651 patent fails to teach or suggest the comparator as recited in Claim 1. For this reason alone, Claim 1 is distinctly different and thus is patentable.

The gaming scheme disclosed in the cited '651 patent allows a player to decide whether the machine has a good transient probability of winning or a poor one. Thus pre-calculating a desired outcome for a simulation would be misleading in the context of the cited '651 patent and run counter to the intention of the disclosure of the document. This further demonstrates that the cited '651 patent is technically very different from the gaming machine recited in Claim 1. Once again, this shows that Claim 1 is patentable.

The lack of a pre-calculated desired outcome of the game in the gaming system in the cited '651 patent further suggests that the system in the cited '651 patent lacks the recited adjustment means as recited in Claim 1. Nothing in the cited '651 patent provides anything that is remotely related to the recited means for adjusting the starting parameters such that the end condition of the subsequent running of the simulation in a visible manner coincides with the end condition of the desired outcome of the game. This difference further shows that Claim 1 is patentable.

Therefore, the cited '651 patent fails to teach or suggest several features recited in Claim 1. Under 35 USC 102(b), Claim 1 is patentable. Accordingly, its dependent claims 2-9 are patentable based on at least the above reasons.

Claim 10 also distinctly differs from the cited '651 patent. For example, the cited '651 patent fails to teach or suggest the following recited features in Claim 10:

> "deriving a desired outcome for the game;
> comparing the end condition of the simulation using the starting parameters, with the desired outcome;
> adjusting the previously set starting parameters of the simulation as a result of the comparing; and
> re-running the simulation in a visible manner such that its end condition coincides with the desired outcome of the game."

As described in connection with Figure 1, the cited '651 patent does not have a desired outcome for its simulated games and does perform a comparison between the actual outcome of the simulation and the desired outcome. The cited '651 patent also fails to re-run the simulation with adjusted parameters such that the end condition coincides with the desired outcome as recited in claim 10.

In respect to the dependent claims 11-17, each is patentable based on the reasons set forth above for the base Claim 10 and on its own merits.

In summary, the disclosure of the cited '651 patent has little relevance to the subject matter in Claims 1-17. It is respectfully suggested that the rejections in the Final Office Action fail to meet the Patent Office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability and the finality of the office action is improper. Accordingly, Claims 1-17 are distinctly patentable and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully urges the Patent Office to withdraw all rejections and allow the application.

Attorney's Docket No.: 13625-002001

No fee is believed due, however, please apply any applicable charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 15, 2005

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

/BY BING AI REG. NO. 43,312

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: **20985**
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10484909.doc